

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

23rd Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XXIII, No. 15

P. O. Box 6226A, Washington, D. C. 20015

© October 1, 1993

Healy Running Hard

Ex-Director of NIH Given A Chance in Senate Race

Rare, if not unique: A senior member of the national science establishment running for the US Senate, not as a hopeless fringe candidate, but in a well-financed pursuit of the Republican nomination. The candidate, for the seat coming vacant in Ohio, is Bernadine Healy, whose tumultuous two-year reign as Director of the National Institutes of Health ended in June after the Clinton Administration asked her to step down. Last month, she announced her candidacy for the Senate. SGR asked Steve Lutner, politics writer for Cleveland's The Plain Dealer, Ohio's largest-circulation newspaper, to review Healy's campaign style and political prospects. Following is his report:

It's a long shot, but far from impossible. Bernadine Healy, campaigning as a heart doctor who believes there are too many lawyers in Washington, must overcome her lack of public recognition in the state. For this she will need TV money to penetrate the big, separate TV markets of Columbus, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Toledo, and a flock of smaller cities. The chances are good that she can raise a lot of money for the primary in May, and if victorious, even more for the 1994 election campaign.

Healy's primary campaign is chaired by Arthur Modell,

Basic Research Takes a Beating On Two Fronts in Washington—Page 6

owner of the Cleveland Browns football team and a longtime national Republican booster who is an old friend of Healy and her husband, Dr. Floyd Loop, Chief Executive Officer of the Cleveland Clinic. Healy chaired the Clinic's Research Institute before her appointment as Director of NIH in 1991.

Modell reportedly became intrigued by the notion of a Healy candidacy when Ross Perot mentioned her as a possible running mate during his off-and-on presidential campaign last year. Healy shrugged off a Perot connection, but during her time in Washington, took easily to swimming in political waters, and was known to be checking out the Senatorial situation in her adopted state of Ohio.

Traveling the state with Healy when she announced her candidacy, Modell vowed: "Whatever it takes to win, we'll raise." Campaign aides estimate that she would require as much as \$3 million for a contested Republican primary campaign—largely for TV time.

(Continued on Page 2)

Columbia, Tufts, Alabama

Pork-Barrel Champs Say They Have No Regrets

Congressman George Brown Jr. resumed his jousting against pork-barrel appropriations for academic research on September 15, with three marauders in the federal trough, Columbia, Tufts, and the University of Alabama, called in by the California Democrat to explain their gluttony.

The three were not subpoenaed, but, as a Committee staff member told SGR, "They were cajoled and threatened." Louisiana State University, credited with a 1980-92 haul of \$71 million in pork, also known as earmarks, begged off, stating it could not afford the air fare to Washington. "Because of the expense, I am unable to testify in person," Vice Chancellor Harvill C. Eaton advised the Committee in

(Continued on Page 3)

In Brief

While the White House is talking up Russian-American partnership on the Space Station, four senior House members are warning of risks. Go slow and aim for an independent US capability, is the message in a letter dated Sept. 22 to Vice President Gore from House Space Committee Chairman George Brown and Ranking Republican Robert Walker, and NASA Appropriations Chairman Louis Stokes and Ranking Republican Jerry Lewis. The letter also warns that "Russian cooperation may equate to an unnecessary loss of US jobs."

After five months of staving off orders to terminate their research on scientific misconduct and report for conventional duties at NIH, Walter Stewart and Ned Feder got the final word last week: report or else—and they did. The directive came during discussions of a university-based government-paid assignment in which they could return to their preferred tasks. The reassignment by NIH officials was protested by Rep. John Conyers, Chairman of the House Government Operations Committee, who said it "can only have a chilling effect on all whistle-blower activity." Senators Grassley and Cohen have asked incoming NIH Director Harold Varmus for his views and have also requested an inquiry by the General Accounting Office.

Yet another spinoff claimed for the Superconducting Super Collider: contributions to technologies for "tunnel drilling" and "precision surveying," cited by Nobel physicist Leon Lederman, in a *New York Times* Op-Ed article on September 16. Not mentioned was a skill that seems to have eluded the high-energy fraternity: bookkeeping on the SSC, deemed unacceptably incompetent by the Department of Energy, usually tolerant in such matters.

... Dr. Healy, MD, Plays on Anti-Lawyer Sentiments

(Continued from Page 1)

In these embryonic days of the campaign, Healy is putting emphasis on her medical background, contrasting it with Washington's widely villified legal profession. "I really believe that the discipline and training of a lawyer and a doctor are diametrically opposed," she recently said. "A lawyer is taught to be adversarial. It almost doesn't matter what side you're on. Whoever pays you, I guess. But you like to beat up people." Healy adds that doctors are taught to "heal, to make people better, to give them a better life."

Healy is working from the premise that her lack of political credentials—and the public's overlapping contempt for career politicians and lawyers—will sell big next year among Ohio voters when they elect the successor to Howard Metzenbaum, a liberal Democrat who is retiring at age 76 after 19 years in the Senate.

The impending vacancy has created intense interest in Ohio political circles. The best-known candidate on the Republican side at this point is Lt. Governor Michael DeWine, a veteran political figure who ran unsuccessfully in 1992 against John Glenn, Ohio's other Senator. DeWine's campaign in that race was notable for ample financing and aggressive, negative TV advertising. DeWine is a former Congressman who once earned dubious national attention by appearing to doze off during televised Iran-Contra hearings. He has the support of Republican Governor George V. Voinovich, who enjoys strong popularity. But DeWine has been panned for his unexciting campaign style and has thus far failed to arouse support for his second Senate bid in the party's statewide political network.

DeWine is trying to counter Healy's sudden entry into Ohio politics by discounting her electability. In August, he released a poll that showed him with a huge lead over Healy and State Senator Eugene Watts, the third Republican entry in the race for the nomination.

Watts, an Associate Professor of History at Ohio State University, represents Columbus in the state Senate, where he is known for glib, sometimes outrageous, remarks. During a Senate debate earlier this year on a bill to give death row inmates the choice of lethal injection or electrocution, Watts said the bill amounted to coddling convicts. Death-row inmates, he suggested, "should be executed in the same manner they executed their victims, multiple stabbing, or whatever." Despite such barbed rhetoric, Watts has quietly enlisted the financial support of many of corporate Columbus' high-powered Republicans and thus promises to be a presence in the US Senate race.

While DeWine and Watts have years of voting records for opponents to dissect, Healy, as a newcomer to elective politics, has none. Now the state's political press is beginning to probe her background and positions on various issues.

Healy encountered criticism from fellow Republicans earlier this year when *The Plain Dealer* reported that the

would-be Republican candidate is not a registered Republican in Ohio. To be considered a registered Republican in Ohio, one must vote in a Republican primary. Voting records fail to show that Healy has ever done that, thus putting her in the position of asking voters to take part in an electoral process that she has neglected.

Abortion is the issue on which Healy offers the clearest position. She is firmly pro-choice. But she sometimes tends toward fuzziness when confronted with other issues. While acknowledging that reforms must be made in the nation's health-care system, Healy is leery of extensive changes and has been vague about her preferences for the health industry. "We need to deal with affordability, we need to deal with the cost of health care," Healy said in a speech to the Cleveland City Club on August 6. "But," she continued, "I don't believe we need to tear down a system of private health care in order to do it. We don't need to have one size fitting all, because it never works in a country this big. I think the Canadian-style health system would cause a revolution in this country." She asserted that doctors, hospitals, and insurance companies tend to be unfairly blamed for escalating health-care costs.

Healy is on the fence concerning the North American Free Trade Agreement, an issue that has triggered great debate in Ohio. Healy's home is in the Cleveland area, where unionized work forces, such as the United Auto Workers, vehemently oppose the trade agreement.

Healy is more inclined to speak about her impressive resume: *summa cum laude* from Vassar, in 1965; *cum laude* from Harvard Medical School in 1970, followed by post-graduate work in cardiology at the Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, where she served as Professor of Medicine. In 1984, President Reagan appointed her Deputy Director of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, and in 1991, President Bush named her to head NIH. Healy openly declared a desire to continue in that post under Clinton, but was asked to step down.

At this early stage of the primary campaign, the leader on the Democratic side is Metzenbaum's son-in-law, Joel Hyatt, nationally a familiar figure on TV as spokesman for the legal-

(Continued on Page 3)

© 1993, Science & Government Report, Inc.

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Reif

Circulation Manager
Glen D. Grant

Published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscriptions: Institutions, \$425.00 (two years, \$730.00). Bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. NW, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. For subscription service: PO Box 6226A, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. 1-800-522-1970; in Washington, DC 785-5054. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date. ISSN 0048-9581.

... Are You So Deprived That You Can't Compete?

(Continued from Page 1)

the preface to a brief written statement for the hearing.

The Columbia, Tufts, and Alabama representatives were not crestfallen as they faced Chairman Brown and other members of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee. Sanctimonious, evasive, and defiant, they unabashedly defended their past successes at collecting earmarked federal funds and acknowledged that they're now rooting for even more on Capitol Hill. Members of both parties on the Committee joined in with hostile questions and skeptical remarks, but failed to rattle the smooth-talking university officials.

"I am asking if you are a deprived institution that can't successfully compete for these funds, which, as you well know, are in very short supply?" Brown asked David Gute, Interim Director of the Tufts Center for Environmental Management.

Gute responded that Tufts' endowment, \$200 million, is "quite modest," adding: "We are primarily and very proud to be known as a teaching university that does research. So, our research effort is always in support of teaching, and therefore we don't have the broad infrastructure and opportunities that larger universities may have."

Brown asked how much Tufts had paid for lobbying services by Cassidy & Associates, the Washington firm legendary for producing federal money for its clients in even the driest seasons.

Payments totaled \$3,162,056 from 1984 through last June, peaking at \$357,000 in 1991 and \$360,000 last year, Gute answered.

How about Columbia? also a Cassidy client, Brown asked William A. Polf, the University's Deputy Vice President for Health Sciences.

Polf responded with a disquisition on Columbia's many and varied means of "representing itself in Washington," noting that "it has a number of ranking university officials,

including the President and members of the Board of Trustees and people like myself who are somewhat knowledgeable of government work actively on the project."

Rep. Robert Walker, of Pennsylvania, the ranking Republican on the Committee, brought the dialog back to Cassidy and Columbia: "How much are you paying them annually?" he demanded.

Polf replied, "We pay on a monthly basis. We pay a retainer of \$10,000 a month for lobbying services."

Chairman Brown asked Tufts' Gute, "Are you acting the way you are on the advice of your lobbyist?"

Gute. No, sir, I am testifying in terms of the information as I know it as Interim Director of the Center.

Brown. What advice does your lobbyist give you?

Gute. To appear here promptly, tell the truth, be candid and as forthcoming as possible.

Brown. Is that worth \$30,000 a month?

Alabama President Charles McCallum said his school operates without a Washington lobbyist, preferring, instead, to rely on the Alabama Congressional delegation, which includes perhaps the leading pork-render on Capitol Hill, Rep. Tom Bevill, Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that controls wads of money for the Department of Energy.

Brown asked McCallum how Alabama would have fared "if you had not been gifted with one of the most distinguished and influential Members of Congress as Chairman of the Subcommittee that allocates those funds."

Unfazed at being caught in the federal cookie jar, McCallum answered with evident pride: "I would have still attempted to try and tell our delegation of what the needs are of research universities and the needs for infrastructure and the funding of it and finding a mechanism for it."

The three universities were among 50 universities and colleges queried about earmarking practices in a detailed questionnaire from the Committee. Though not the most successful at obtaining earmarked funds, they are high on the charts this year: Alabama, with \$10 million from the Department of Energy for a biological research building; Columbia, \$10 million from the Environmental Protection Agency for a Center for Disease Prevention at a research park near the university's medical center, in Manhattan; and Tufts, \$3.2 million from the EPA for a Center for Environmental Management, on its campus, near Boston.

The federal funds are a small portion of the total costs of these projects, for which money has been collected from a variety of sources. But over the past decade the three universities have reaped millions more in earmarked appropriations for other projects.

The harvest of funds for politically well-connected universities has actually increased since Brown opened his anti-pork campaign nearly three years ago, rising, according to the Congressional Research Service, from 279 projects and

(Continued on Page 4)

Healy vs. Hyatt?

(Continued from Page 2)

clinic empire that bears his name and motto: "You have my word on it."

But Hyatt arrives with what may be a serious liability, the perception of having the seat handed to him—though, in fact, he will have to fight for it. Still, a nepotistic appearance is there. "I don't think most people in Ohio will support a Metzenbaum-Hyatt dynasty," Cleveland Mayor Michael White, a Democrat, warned last year, adding: "I don't think families should have a lock on a Senate seat."

The Senate primary is months away, and is yet to catch the attention of the electorate. But it's already clear that a Hyatt-Healy race would not only be one of the liveliest in the country, but would also give the voters a chance to decide on Healy's thesis about the relative virtues of doctors and lawyers in politics.

... All Admit That They're Now Seeking More Pork

(Continued from Page 3)

\$470 million in 1991 to 499 projects and \$708 million last year. Numbers, definitions, and much else concerning earmarks are in dispute, but they remain a favored means of satisfying the folks back home, and many members of Congress are proud of their ability to deliver.

In Brown's view, the defining criteria of pork are a unilateral grab engineered by friendly legislators and an absence of peer-review acceptable to the federal agencies that must provide the money. Insisting that their projects are extremely worthy, the practitioners of pork explain that they are driven by need and a dearth of federal funds dedicated to new labs on campus. In desperation, they say, they must rely on politicians to satisfy their needs from wherever funds can be found—usually in research agency budgets intended for other purposes.

Denunciations of earmarking as bad citizenship in the community of science have been issued by the National Academy of Sciences, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Association of American Universities, and other pillars of scientific propriety.

No matter. The spokesmen for the three universities remained unrepentant as Brown and his Committee colleagues drummed on the theme of chaos in science policy arising from unilateral raids on government R&D funds.

"Would you all be comfortable with a process that ended up with 100 percent of the money for federal research being done through an earmark process?" Rep. Walker asked.

No, the university spokesmen cautiously agreed, smelling a trap, but unable to answer otherwise.

Walker berated them, asking why the benefits of earmarking should be confined to a small segment of academe with homegrown or purchased lobbying skills?

McCallum modestly replied: "I just am not knowledgeable enough about all the intricacies of Congress to tell Congress how they should handle it. I think that has to be left with those whom we elect as our representatives."

Columbia's Polf acknowledged to Rep. Walker that the university continued to retain the Cassidy firm.

Walker. Would that indicate that you are at the present time seeking earmarks in the Congress?

Polf. We have requested additional funds for the upcoming year.

Walker pursued the issue, raising the argument that earmarkers deliberately avoid Congress's authorizing committees, which, like the one he serves on, are supposed to write basic legislative programs for federal agencies; instead, Willie Sutton style, the earmarkers deal directly with the Appropriations Subcommittees, which virtually control the money process. Left unsaid was that Brown's Committee is entangled in an assortment of jurisdictional scraps with other Committees and influential members, and has passed relatively little authorizing legislation. But Walker, a veteran member of the Committee, proceeded as though it carries

Ag Research "A Scandal"

From a memo by Professor Robert Haselkorn, Department of Molecular Genetics and Cell Biology, University of Chicago, written last March to assist then-President Hanna H. Gray in preparing a response to Congressman Brown's questionnaire about earmarked funds. The research program Haselkorn refers to is administered by the Midwest Plant Biology Consortium, jointly funded by federal agencies and industrial firms, and, according to Haselkorn, rigorously peer-reviewed.

It is legitimate to ask whether this program could have been funded through the regular peer-reviewed grant system of the USDA. Representative Brown knows as well as anyone what a scandal that program is. The USDA supports close to a billion dollars worth of research. All but \$70 million is "earmarked" by formula to the state land grant institutions and regional USDA labs.

The \$70 million is further subdivided into a number of special programs so that true basic research on plants has less than \$10 million. In the area to which I apply, nitrogen fixation, the annual budget is less than \$2 million and there are over 100 applications of which usually at least 30% are meritorious.... The USDA should be replaced by an Institute for Agriculture Research with a budget comparable to one of the National Institutes of Health, say a billion dollars, run by people with a background in the NSF or NIH, not USDA.

The USDA does not understand basic research in terms of sustained support at a level that is competitive with the rest of the world.... With suitable budgets and commitment, US universities could become collectively competitive in plant molecular biology with the rest of the world, but not if they have to depend on the nickel and dime operation run by USDA.

great weight in Congress.

Walker. Have you ever come to this Committee to talk... about the needs that you have in the scientific research area, or any other authorizing Committees to talk to them about the needs that you have so that they could be appropriately authorized rather than simply earmarked?

Polf. No, we have not.

Rep. Xavier Becerra (D-Calif.) asked Alabama's McCallum whether his University engaged in discussions with the Department of Energy before earmarked legislation directed DOE to provide \$10 million for the Alabama project.

McCallum. Our proposal was developed for the biomedical research facility by the faculty at the University of Alabama at Birmingham and then presented to the [Alabama

(Continued on Page 5)

... NASA Told to Shell Out \$9 Million for a Planetarium

(Continued from Page 4)

Congressional] delegation....

Becerra. And did the faculty within the University engage in any conversations with the Department of Energy's representatives?

McCallum. Not that I know of, until after the bill was passed by Congress authorizing the commitment of that money. Then we worked with the Department of Energy's Facility Planning in carrying out the construction project.

Asked about consultations with the EPA, Polf said that "we did not consult the agency before the appropriation was made." The project, however, was reviewed and approved, he said—by New York Congressmen.

"In the process of talking with the Appropriations Committee," Polf explained, "the members of our Congressional delegation who were interested in this project did, in fact, review with us the significant ways we felt that this project would help enhance the mission of EPA, and so we had that communication."

Tuft's Gute responded to Becerra's inquiry about agency support with a question: "Support indicated in what way?"

Becerra. Well, in any way did the EPA say to Congress or the members of the Appropriations Committee, yes, we support the project for which Tufts seeks earmarked funds?

Gute. I understand—it's my understanding that support for CEM [Center for Environmental Management] has in some instances appeared in the EPA budget and then has been excised by OMB [Office of Management and Budget].

Becerra. Okay. Can you provide us with that information?

Gute. I have no written information to support that.... It's my understanding that is correct.

Becerra. And the understanding comes from where?

Gute. Really from conversations that I have had with the prior Director at CEM.

The university representatives were followed as witnesses by officials of agencies on which earmarks have been frequently inflicted—each telling tales of funds diverted by Congressional edict from priorities set by the agencies.

Speaking for the DOE, the most heavily raided target, Elizabeth Smedley said earmarks this year totaled \$190 million, double the haul in 1990, and that over the past four years, DOE's earmarks have totaled \$600 million.

Alvin Pesachowitz, from the EPA, listed academic earmarks this year at his agency totaling over \$23 million, for 21 projects, adding that "we have been forced to fund Congressional earmarks at the expense of our higher priority base program." He conceded, however, that "most earmarks are projects that the agency would have funded some time in the future or if greater funds were available to the agency."

Turning to the representative from NASA, Robert W. Brown, Deputy Associate Administrator for Human Resources and Education, the Chairman asked: "Did you ever announce a program for the funding of a planetarium at community colleges?"

"No, we did not," replied the NASA man.

"And yet you funded the Delta College [near Bay City, Michigan] for a planetarium as an earmark"—a \$9 million bite from NASA's budget.

"Yes. It was in the Congressional report," he explained.

Chairman Brown brought up NASA earmarks at Wheeling Jesuit College, in West Virginia, homestate of Senator Robert Byrd, Chairman of the Appropriations Committee—\$2.8 million for a "classroom of the future" and additional funds for a National Technology Transfer Center, raising Wheeling's earmark total to over \$30 million. "I am just inquiring whether you had a specific program, invited applications, received them in connection with this?" Chairman Brown asked.

"No, we did not," the NASA official replied.

Brown asked Smedley, of DOE, to "cite for me the specific authorization that the Department of Energy has to construct hospitals or medical centers."

Smedley. I know of none.

Brown. And yet you spend quite a few tens of millions, maybe hundreds of millions, on that?

Smedley. Yes, we have.

Brown slogs on with his campaign, and claims, with some evidence, that he's finally swaying influential hearts on Capitol Hill. But the pork brigade is determined and resourceful, and Brown's Committee lacks the authority to block the route to the US Treasury. It can spotlight and embarrass participants in the earmarking process, occasionally tangle the tainted appropriations in legislative snarls, and encourage federal research agencies to resist intrusions on their spending plans. But by itself, it cannot throttle pork-barrel appropriations.

Brown received a gesture of backing in the recent annual report of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee with jurisdiction for NSF, NASA, EPA research, and the Housing and Veterans departments. The Subcommittee, chaired by Barbara Mikulski (D-Md.), echoing the argument that earmarking is spawned by inadequate funds for lab buildings, urged a collaborative solution by federal and state governments and academe. Though the Subcommittee was confronted by earmarkers, the report says, it turned them down.

The trouble is that Mikulski's appropriations jurisdiction has never been a major source of earmarked funds. DOE, Defense, and Agriculture are the profitable fields of play. And whenever one of them is stopped up, another is opened, as Brown glumly noted near the close of the hearing.

"You are all aware of the fact," he said, "that when the House was presented with an opportunity to vote on about \$100 million of these earmarks last November, they rejected them overwhelmingly."

Smedley, the witness from DOE, replied, "My bill, yes."

"And didn't you marvel," Brown continued, "at how it magically reappeared in the defense bill a week later?"

"Yes," the DOE official replied, "we marveled."—DSG

The Signs Are Not Favorable for Basic Research

Against the backdrop of the Clinton Administration's strong emphasis on technology for profit and health, new dark omens for basic research have appeared on the Washington scene in recent weeks.

The widely leaked draft of the Clinton health plan devotes 2 of its 239 pages to "Health Research Initiatives" without any reference to long-term research or fundamental science. Virtually all the discussion of health research is confined to prevention research.

A section on "Academic Health Centers" states that a pool of funds derived from Medicare payments and surcharges on private insurance, totaling \$6 billion in fiscal 1994, will "support costs associated with the institutional costs of research, development of new medical technology, treatment of rare and unusually severe illnesses and provision of specialized patient care." There's no discussion of academic health centers as the homebase of basic biomedical research.

The draft is, of course, merely a skeleton for the eventual health plan. But what must be noted at this point is that, despite its substantial length and considerable detail, it offers an extremely truncated view of the role of research in health care. That's not surprising, given that NIH was not invited into the 500-member task force that wrote the plan.

The report of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee for the National Science Foundation also reflects the theme of do something useful, quickly—also known

as "strategic research." While providing a respectable 9 percent budget increase for NSF, the Subcommittee bluntly states: "It is time for the Foundation to move beyond rhetorical statements about the value of strategic research or the importance of using science for the transfer of knowledge and technology. That, in the Committee's view, is a fact of life and political reality.

"Instead," the report continues, "it is now time for the Foundation to move to identify that which is specific, immediate, and realizable in pursuit of this broader mission.... If the NSF and its constituent members choose not to do this, future Federal R&D budgets should instead be allocated more generously to agencies such as the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NASA, the national energy labs, or the National Institutes of Health, all of whom seem poised to pursue critical technologies with entrepreneurial vigor and enthusiasm."

Following release of this prescription, NSF officials conferred last week with staff members of the Subcommittee, which is chaired by Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-Md.). One attendee put a bright face on the meeting, telling SGR that the strong wording of the Senate report creates a misleading impression of the Subcommittee's attitude toward the role of NSF.

At this point, the Foundation is officially headless, pending Senate confirmation of Neal Lane, former Provost of Rice University, as Director.

Job Changes & Appointments

Jay Moskowitz, chief aide to the Director during the unlamented Bernadine Healy regime at NIH, has moved from the NIH front office to the National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders, where he has been appointed Deputy Director. Moskowitz held the title of NIH Associate Director for Science Policy and Legislation when Healy arrived in 1991. She promptly put him in charge of her top priority task—preparation of a strategic plan for NIH—and subsequently elevated him to the newly created job of NIH Deputy Director for Science Policy and Technology Transfer. When Healy was dropped by the Clinton Administration in June, Moskowitz was first in line for the role of Acting Director, but the assignment, controlled by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, went to **Ruth Kirschstein**, Director of the National Institute of General Medical Sciences.

France Anne Cordova, head of the Astronomy and Astrophysics Department at Penn State University, has been appointed Chief Scientist of NASA, a post located in the Office of the NASA Administrator. Her predecessor, **Lennard Fisk**, is now in the Department of Atmospheric, Oceanic, and Space Sciences at the University of Michigan. Cordova is scheduled to start work at NASA in mid-October.

Charles Edwards, former head of the Scripps Institutions of Medicine and Science, has been appointed President of the newly created California Healthcare Institute, formed by health-related high-term firms to conduct research on health-policy issues. Edwards headed the US Food and Drug Administration from 1969-73 and subsequently served as Assistant Secretary for Health in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Daryl Chubin, a Senior Associate at the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, has joined the National Science Foundation as Division Director for Research, Evaluation, and Dissemination in the Education and Human Resources Directorate.

Edward Wenk Jr., Professor Emeritus of Engineering and Public Affairs at the University of Washington, is serving on the staff of Washington Governor Mike Lowry as a State Executive Fellow of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers. The fellowship program is designed to make the services of retired members available to state governments. Prior to joining academe in 1970, Wenk served in a variety of senior science advisory posts in Congress and at the White House.

Victor McElheny is on leave from the directorship of the Knight Science Journalism Fellows program at MIT to write a biography of Edwin Land, founder of Polaroid.

More IN PRINT: Star Wars, AIDS, NIH Committees

(Continued from Page 8)

the DOE chief is not rated a strong performer on the Washington power scale.

Also from the GAO: *Ballistic Missile Defense: Evolution and Current Issues* (GAO/NSIAD-93-229; 84 pp., no charge), a concise review of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), rechristened the Ballistic Missile Defense Program in May following a decade of technological flops that added up to a \$30 billion extravaganza. Whatever the name, it lives on, with the Clinton Administration seeking \$3.4 billion for next year. Referring to the pre-Clinton era, the GAO says the program, "has been hampered because the executive branch made plans and started projects on the basis of unrealistic and overly optimistic funding requests and schedules." Despite many claims of valuable industrial spinoffs from SDI, the GAO reports that of 2000 "ideas" in the program's data base, only "97 have already or will within the next year result in commercial products."

Another from the GAO: *Pesticides: A Comparative Study of Industrialized Nations' Regulatory Systems* (GAO/PEMD-93-17; 104 pp., no charge), a review of pesticide regulation in 18 member nations of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and the European Community, commissioned by the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. The GAO reports "a high degree of uniformity" among all the nations, including the US, in "the kinds of test data that are required to register food-use pesticides." But it says evaluation procedures differ substantially, with the US employing "a quantitative risk assessment model to estimate cancer risks, whereas OECD nations apply a threshold model." The report also says that the US regulatory process is more open and publicly accountable than its foreign counterparts.

Order from: USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, Md. 20884-6015; tel. 202/512-6000; fax 301/258-4066.

Behavioral and Social Sciences and the HIV/AIDS Epidemic (52 pp., \$7.50 for shipping), after its final report last summer, a leftover document from the National Commission on AIDS, which, by original legislative design, ended its four-year operation on September 3. The Commission, consistently critical of the federal response to AIDS, continues that theme here, charging that "to a very disturbing extent, the potential contributions of behavioral and social sciences have not been utilized in the battle against AIDS." Also available: a list of the many reports and statements issued by the Commission, as well as the documents themselves.

Order from: CDC National AIDS Clearinghouse, PO Box 6003, Rockville, Md. 20849-6003; tel. 1-800/458-5231; fax 301/738-6616, attn. Kevin Fitzpatrick.

The Contribution of Pharmaceutical Companies: What's At Stake for America? (168 pp., no charge), a counterattack,

sponsored by 19 major drug manufacturers, who complain that the "health care policy debate is focused disproportionately on the pharmaceutical industry." Drugs account for only 7 percent of the nation's health bill, they assert, and spare millions from the risks and higher costs of surgery and other treatments. The report, prepared by the Boston Consulting Group, traces the development of major drug categories and lauds the industry for many virtues, including its "strong demand for skilled scientists and engineers."

Order from: Schering-Plough Corporation, Corporate Communications, 1 Giralda Farms, Madison, New Jersey 07940; attn. Risa Lax; tel. 201/822-7405; fax 201/822-7447.

NIH Advisory Committees: Authority, Structure, Functions, Members, April 1993 (NIH 93-10; 623 pp., no charge), fresh off the press, and substantially out of date before it appeared, the big book lists names, titles, and addresses of the thousands serving on NIH's vast advisory system, as of last March 31. Many appointments, however, have since expired. Of more permanent value in the volume are the charters of the advisory bodies, though some of these are being axed in Clinton's slim-government drive. A prefatory note states that the publication "has been delayed due to unforeseen difficulties." That means computer manglings, SGR is told. Supposedly annual, the book was not published last year, and is en route to being replaced by an electronic bulletin board, from which grant applicants can obtain current rosters of the panels that will settle their fate. Why this paper version was published is another mystery of Bethesda.

Order from: Committee Management Office, NIH, Building 31, Room 3B-55, Bethesda, Md. 20892; tel. 301/496-2123; fax 301/402-1567.

To Order or Renew

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station, Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription ☐ Enter my subscription

Institutional subscribers: one year, \$425.00 ☐
two years, \$730.00 ☐

Non-USA airmail, \$35.00 per year; non-USA surface
mail, \$15.00 per year additional

☐ Check enclosed ☐ Please Bill

Please charge to: ☐ MasterCard ☐ VISA

Account# _____ Exp. date _____

Signature _____

Name _____

Address _____

Zip _____

Toll-Free Subscription Service: 1-800-522-1970
In Wash., D.C.: 785-5054 / FAX: (202) 362-2790

IN PRINT: Property Rights, Math Assessment, Etc.

The publications listed are obtainable as indicated—not from SGR.

Intellectual Property Rights in Industry-Sponsored University Research: A Guide to Alternatives for Research Agreements (26 pp., no charge), a collaborative product by the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (an offshoot of the National Academy of Sciences) and the Industrial Research Institute, suggesting contract language for protecting intellectual property rights in academic-industrial research partnerships. The discussion ranges over three basic scenarios—ownership by one or the other party or joint ownership—and also examines rights of refusal, licensing arrangements, royalty provisions, etc. The Roundtable, a decade-old meeting ground for the major sectors of research, is chaired by former Ohio Governor Richard H. Celeste, who cautions against expectations that “university-industry research relationships will generate substantial income for all involved. Experience just does not bear that out,” he states, adding that “at MIT, viewed by many as the archetype at forging university-industry relationships, gross revenue from all licensing operations is equal to an amount which is less than 2 percent of the university’s overall research budget.” Loftier goals than money should inspire these deals, Celeste advises.

Order from: National Academy of Sciences, Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW (NAS 340), Washington, DC 20418; tel. 202/334-3486; fax 202/334-1505.

Multinationals and the National Interest: Playing by Different Rules (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01338-0; 165 pp., \$10), from the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), a general discussion of the rapid spread of multi-national enterprises, including a review of foreign investment in American high-tech industry and academic research. Noting Congressional fulminations about foreign, particularly Japanese, financial ties to university labs in the US, OTA says money from abroad is a minuscule share of total funding—perhaps \$75 million in the \$17 billion spent on basic and applied research in academe in 1991. However, OTA adds: “It is, nevertheless, possible that a foreign company could strategically sponsor research or license university-developed technology to obtain significant returns. If that technology was originally funded with government support, there might be reason for US taxpayers to be concerned.”

Also from OTA: **US Telecommunications Services in European Markets** (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01334-7; 220 pp., \$14), says American pursuit of Europe’s rapidly expanding telecommunications markets raises concerns about diversion of investment from domestic needs, including research. “There is so far no clear evidence of such harmful effects,” OTA concludes, “but investment patterns should be

monitored to detect any emerging adverse effects so that corrective measures can be taken if appropriate.” The report adds, “It is clear, however, that industry R&D expenditures are likely to shrink, or at best remain flat, in the foreseeable future, and that R&D is also likely to be more tightly focused on near-term products and services innovation.”

Order from: New Orders, Superintendent of Documents, PO Box 371954, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15250-7954; tel. 202/783-3238; fax 202/512-2250. Add 25 percent for international orders.

Measuring What Counts: A Conceptual Guide for Mathematics Assessment (227 pp., \$17.95; 20-page summary, titled “A Policy Brief,” \$3.95; add \$4 for shipping), from the Mathematical Sciences Education Board at the National Academy of Sciences, suggestions for harmonizing curriculum, instruction, and assessment in mathematics, a venture that the Board says “will require years of exploration by thousands of practitioners working with mathematics education specialists and measurement experts to achieve a more effective balance of assessment in practice.” The Board is chaired by Hyman Bass, Professor of Mathematics, Columbia University, and received support from NSF and the US Department of Education.

Order from: National Academy Press, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW, Box 285, Washington, DC 20055; tel. 800/624-6242; in Washington, DC, area: 202/334-3313.

Department of Energy: Management Problems Require a Long-Term Commitment to Change (GAO/RCED-93-72; 52 pp., no charge), from the General Accounting Office (GAO), an addition to the voluminous literature on managerial incoherence at DOE. Describing “continuing confusion with field roles and responsibilities,” despite DOE’s repeated vows of reform, the GAO study takes special note of the agency’s three defense labs, Los Alamos, Lawrence Livermore, and Sandia. All report to the Washington-based Assistant Secretary for Defense Programs, the report states. “However, the field office in San Francisco oversees administrative matters at Lawrence Livermore, a defense laboratory, but reports to [the Office of] Energy Research in Washington. By contrast, Los Alamos—Livermore’s sister laboratory—reports to the Albuquerque field office, which reports to Defense Programs.... The Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy is the lead PSO [Program Secretarial Officer] for the Idaho and Oak Ridge field offices, but these offices and their facilities have few programs in nuclear energy. The dominant source of funds for the Idaho field office are the headquarters offices of the Environmental Management and Defense Programs, not Nuclear Energy.” And so on. Attributing DOE’s chronic maladministration to a tradition of ironclad nuclear secrecy and reliance on outside contractors, the GAO advises DOE Secretary Hazel O’Leary to be tough and aggressive about reforms. So far, however,

(Continued on Page 7)

